	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 23-10063-shl
4	x
5	In the Matter of:
6	
7	GENESIS GLOBAL HOLDCO, LLC,
8	
9	Debtor.
10	x
11	
12	United States Bankruptcy Court
13	One Bowling Green
14	New York, NY 10004-1408
15	
16	Wednesday, February 21, 2024
17	11:22 AM
18	
19	
20	
21	BEFORE:
22	HON. SEAN H. LANE
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE
24	
25	ECRO: ARIANNA PERSAUD

Page 2 CONFERENCE re discovery requests in connection with a pending 9019 motion RULING re discovery requests in connection with a pending 9019 motion Transcribed by: Doreen A. Bolognini

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP
4	Attorneys for Debtor
5	One Liberty Plaza
6	New York, NY 10006
7	
8	BY: THOMAS S. KESSLER (VIRTUALLY)
9	SEAN A. O'NEAL (VIRTUALLY)
10	
11	WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
12	Attorneys for Digital Currency Group (DCG)
13	767 Fifth Avenue
14	New York, NY 10153-0119
15	
16	BY: JOSH WESNESKI (VIRTUALLY)
17	JEFFREY D. SAFERSTEIN (VIRTUALLY)
18	FURQAAN SIDDIQUI (VIRTUALLY)
19	
20	PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
21	Attorneys for Ad Hoc Group
22	Eleven Times Square
23	Eighth Avenue and 41st Street
24	New York, NY 10036-8299
25	

		<u> </u>
		Page 4
1	BY:	BRIAN S. ROSEN (VIRTUALLY)
2		JORDAN SAZANT (VIRTUALLY)
3		
4	MCDE	RMOTT WILL & EMERY
5		Attorneys for Crypto Creditor Ad Hoc Group
6		One Vanderbilt Avenue
7		New York, NY 10017-3852
8		
9	BY:	GREER GRIFFITH (VIRTUALLY)
10		JOSEPH B. EVANS (VIRTUALLY)
11		
12	WHIT	E & CASE LLP
13		Attorneys for Committee of Unsecured Creditors
14		1221 Avenue of the Americas
15		New York, NY 10020-1095
16		
17	BY:	SEQUOIA KAUL (VIRTUALLY)
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 5 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Sean Lane in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern 3 District of New York, and we're here for an 11 o'clock 4 5 conference in the Genesis case, specifically about a 6 discovery issue that has arisen. 7 And so, let me start by getting appearances, first 8 on the behalf of the Debtor. 9 MR. KESSLER: Good morning, Your Honor. Tom 10 Kessler from Cleary Gottlieb Steen and Hamilton, on behalf 11 of the Debtors. And I am joined this morning by my partner 12 Sean O'Neal. 13 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. And on behalf of DCG? 14 15 MR. WESNESKI: Good morning, Your Honor. Josh 16 Wesneski from Weil Gotshal and Manges, on behalf of DCG. 17 With me is Jeff Saferstein and Furquan Siddiqui. THE COURT: All right, good morning. On behalf of 18 19 the Ad Hoc Group? 20 MR. ROSEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Brian 21 Rosen, Proskauer Rose. With me this morning is Mr. Jordan 22 Sazant. 23 THE COURT: Good morning. On behalf of the Crypto 24 Ad Hoc Group? 25 MS. GRIFFITH: Good morning, Your Honor. Greer

Page 6 1 Griffith from McDermott Will and Emery. With me today is my 2 colleague Joe Evans. THE COURT: All right, good morning. And anyone 3 else who needs to make an appearance this morning who I may 4 5 have inadvertently overlooked? 6 MS. KAUL: Good morning, Your Honor. Sequoia Kaul 7 from White and Case on behalf of the Committee of Unsecured 8 Creditors. 9 THE COURT: All right. My apologies. I -- I had 10 you written down but I hadn't called you, so I clearly 11 goofed there. Thank you very much for making your presence 12 known. 13 Anyone else who needs to make an appearance? All So today is the follow-up on a conversation that was 14 15 -- that we dipped our toe in the water but didn't actually 16 fully jump in the other day. 17 And, Mr. Kessler, I think it was your discovery 18 issue, so why don't you start us off and I will make sure to 19 circle the virtual room for everybody's views who's 20 interested before we're done. 21 MR. KESSLER: Very good. Thank you, Your Honor. 22 Tom Kessler from Cleary Gottlieb, again for the record. 23 This is a, I think, a pretty straightforward dispute that we have with DCG. 24 25 We served discovery requests on DCG in connection

with a pending 9019 motion seeking to settle the New York

Attorney General's claims. Among other things, those

requests asked for communications between DCG and the New

York Attorney General's Office. The time period that we

sought for those communications was July 14th, 2023 through

February 8th, 2024. That's the same period that DCG asked

for communications from the Debtors and the same period that

the Debtors produced communications in response to DCG's

requests.

After some back and forth, DCG has agreed to produce, and just this morning has produced communications beginning on October 19th, 2023. That's the date of the New York Attorney General's initial complaint, but they have refused to provide documents from the earlier period, from July 14th through 10/19. And argue those documents are every bit as responsive as the later set.

Number 1, as I mentioned, it's the same time period that DCG itself sought discovery from the Debtors for. And I think more directly, during the discovery that has been adduced over the past week, there have been lines of questioning and depositions that have inquired as to the appropriateness of the settlement in light of the purported or relative value of the claims asserted by the New York Attorney General. There have been questions questioning the timing of the settlement discussions that the Debtors were

having with the New York Attorney General's Office.

And so, from our perspective, to the extent that there were communications going on between DCG and between the New York Attorney General, in particular, with respect to a potential settlement of the claims that were being investigated and then formally brought by the New York AG, we think that bears on the arguments that we expect DCG to make in their filing here in about half an hour.

So it's a small -- as far as we understand it's a narrow time parameter. I expect it to be a small set of documents. I will confess that as of the last discussion we had with DCG's Counsel yesterday late afternoon, it was our understanding that they had not searched for those communications and couldn't tell whether or what the volume of those communications would be or whether there were any relative communications in that time period. And so, without that information we're simply not in a position to accept the premise that searching, collecting, and producing those documents would somehow be a burden.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wesneski, what can you tell me?

MR. WESNESKI: Sure, Your Honor. Thank you. Josh Wesneski of Weil Gotshal, on behalf of DCG. Just one quick point in response to Mr. Kessler's last comment. We have undertaken some efforts to figure out the universe of

documents here.

As I expressed to Mr. Kessler, the challenge with the additional time period is that there are additional custodians we would have to collect from beyond what has already been done. We are working with those folks to try and get ahead of this issue if we need to, but there are documents that we don't believe are relevant but would be perhaps technically responsive to the RFP's from the Debtors. So there are some documents, again, we don't think they're relevant.

But I think more -- more sort of centrally, you know, we're here on a motion by the Debtors to approve of a settlement between the Debtors and the New York Attorney General. DCG is not a party to that settlement. The claims against DCG are not being settled under that agreement. They're not even really at issue except perhaps collaterally.

So what DCG thinks about the claims against it or the efforts with the New York Attorney General to settle with those claims, has really no bearing on whether or not the settlement here for the Debtors is justifiable within the range of reasonable settlement.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not so sure about that, right? The -- I've read the complaint. It's customer-focused to say that at the end of the day they think the

customers ended up on the short end of the stick and that that was a result of -- of the actions of the Defendants.

And so, if -- if that's the case, how exactly the actions of various parties overlapped in terms of what the customers ultimately got in the AG's point of view, the actual overlap may be not precise, but if -- I'm having trouble siloing it as a totally separate issue.

And so, if -- if you're going to make a run at the claim saying -- and I think it was just said about whether the -- there's essentially questioning the relative value of the claim, I think is how Mr. Kessler put it -- I -- I'm having trouble understanding why those conversations couldn't theoretically be -- be relevant.

MR. WESNESKI: Well, I think, Your Honor, there's

-- there are two questions. One is with respect to the

underlying conduct, is there overlap between the claims

against DCG and the claims against the Debtors; and

certainly that's the case. Much of the, you know, the same

-- much of the same conduct that is alleged with respect to

the Debtors also forms the basis for the claims against DCG.

And we think that there are additional arguments that DCG

has access to that the Debtors don't have access to, but -
but I agree certainly, as sort of basically that the

allegations are the same.

But what we're asking here is whether the

negotiations as to a settlement overlap or are relevant to the evaluation of the settlement put forth by the Debtors that focuses exclusively on the Debtor's (inaudible).

So the Debtors certainly are of the opinion through the settlement that their claims can be desegregated from those of DCG, that they can be evaluated separately and they can be settled separately. So they've taken that position that they can in fact be siloed; they have siloed them in their settlement with the New York Attorney General. So we don't think that they can pull in the claims against DCG and look at, you know, what DCG has advocated to the New York Attorney General about the value of those claims or the merits of those claims, to say whether the settlement here is within the reasonable range of values.

And I'll add just one more point here. You know, we -- we have been trying to work collaboratively and -- and productively with the Debtors, and I think that we have done so on both sides. Where we were, you know, sort of headed was to try and figure out what actually is it that the Debtors want here. You know, I understood the Debtors were principally concerned about was the timing point.

The timing of the settlement discussions between the Debtors and the New York Attorney General has lined up or not lined up with what DCG was doing within that same time period. And the time period that was represented to me

was late-Fall through February 2024. That's the time period that the Debtors are concerned about with respect to their negotiations and we've produced the documents between DCG and the New York Attorney General in that timespan.

What we're talking about is pre-complaint
negotiations or discussions or communications that -- that
necessarily would not overlap or line up with the -- the
time period that we're talking about later on between the
Debtors and the New York Attorney General. So I think based
on what they have represented to us at least, is the basis
for why they need these documents. We've provided all the
information that they need to make any deductions or
conclusions about what DCG was saying or negotiating with
the New York Attorney General during those relevant time
period.

I think we're already sort of in the outer boundaries of relevancy. You know, we wanted to negotiate that. We wanted to compromise so that's why we produced the documents that we did. But now, trying to go even further to a time period that we think really doesn't have any overlap or relevance to what the Debtors have indicated is the basis for their document request.

THE COURT: All right. Let me circle the room, and we'll start with the official committee.

Page 13 1 MS. KAUL: Nothing from us, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: All right. Anything from the Ad Hoc 3 Group? MR. ROSEN: Nothing, Your Honor, other than the 4 5 fact that I thought it was interesting that Mr. Wesneski 6 said that this was a settlement and that they really didn't 7 have anything to say about it because it was a settlement 8 that the Debtors entered into, and yet they served us with 9 discovery, claiming that we should be responsive to that, 10 even though the Ad Hoc Group was not a party to the 11 settlement itself. I thought it was just a little bit 12 contradictory on his part. Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: All right, thank you. On behalf of 14 the Crypto Ad Hoc Group? 15 MS. GRIFFITH: Nothing from us, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. Anybody that I may have 17 missed who wants to chime in? All right. 18 I am -- I'm -- see this the way the Debtors see 19 this for a couple of reasons. I -- I -- the notion that you 20 can have exactly the same -- I mean, there was a concession 21 that this is overlapping conduct for the claim, same 22 allegations, and the notion you can silo it simply because 23 there's a settlement of one party and not another, that doesn't make any sense to me, right? Individual defendants 24 25 settle cases all the time. That doesn't mean that -- and --

and settling or not settling is a -- is a function of a lot of different considerations by parties. But that doesn't mean in an instance where you're really talking about the same allegations that -- that if the -- if -- if DCG is asked for this kind of information for this exact same period, it -- it seems frankly, fairly aggressive to say that -- that what's good for the goose isn't good for the gander. And so, I don't -- I -- I don't see any way that this isn't relevant.

Now again, I don't know exactly when who was talking to with who about what, but that's not the way you look at discovery because that's what the -- the argument will be about the 9019 and the merits of whatever the issues are. But for purposes of discovery, the fact that there's overlapping allegations by the AG's about what they view as improper conduct that led them to sue the parties that they sued because of damage to the customers is -- so it seems to be -- if it's relevant for the Debtors and indeed for the Ad Hoc Group, it -- it would seem to certainly be fair game for DCG.

And as to the timeframe, I can understand the timeframe issue but again, it's what DCG has asked for the same timeframe, and if -- if you think that timeframe is relevant, then it seems only fair to -- to hold you to that same view when -- when looking at discovery the other way.

So -- so from my point of view, it also doesn't seem to be frankly, a particularly voluminous set of documents that you're going to get, you know, in terms of what discovery looks like it matters. It seems to be fair, and again, it seems to be proportional to what the ask is for -- for the other way. And so, again, given the same -- same allegations, the fact that you're -- you're both -- both parties are -are parties to the AG's lawsuit and -- and what the settlement is, the reasonableness as to the settlement really has to do with people's views about the litigation. It seems to be fair game. So -- so that's my ruling and I trust that those documents can be searched for and produced. It sounds like there are additional custodians. And so, in light of that, what I'd ask is that those documents be produced as soon as possible on a rolling basis. There's no need to wait for all the documents to be assembled to start producing what you already have in your possession. And so with that, any other issues anyone needs to address here this morning? MR. SAFERSTEIN: Your Honor, if I may? Jeffrey Saferstein from Weil Gotshal on behalf of DCG. THE COURT: Okay. MR. SAFERSTEIN: Your Honor, I just wanted to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

preview for the Court our objection will be filed in the next 20 minutes or so to the motion for approval to settlement with the New York Attorney General. And again, I want to preview for the Court we're going to be filing that under seal given the confidential information that we've received from other parties.

So as we discussed yesterday, our plan is to work with parties to see what actually needs to be redacted and filed under seal and what does not. But I just wanted to let Your Honor know that that was happening.

THE COURT: I appreciate that. And -- and frankly, those conversations are easier to have when you file what you have filed, and then you can send it out to people and say what if anything needs to remain under seal. So I think the one-step, two-step we're going to have then is -- is what we sort of contemplated the other day. You file it under seal and then once you have those conversations you file a -- a subsequent unredacted, either full or partially unredacted document that you can link back on the ECF system to the original filing and so people will understand sort of the one-step, two-step. But thank you for the heads-up.

And obviously do us a favor and send us an unredacted copy. I know you all have been very good about doing that. You'd be surprised the cases where sometimes we

-- we have to ask people to get those and we really -- when something's redacted obviously, we -- you don't send it to us, we don't have it. So that would be great. Thank you for bringing that issue up. Anything else?

MR. SAFERSTEIN: Nothing here, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KESSLER: Your Honor, it's Tom Kessler from Cleary Gottlieb again for the Debtors. Two short things.

One, like Mr. Saferstein, I suspect we'll also be filing our reply under seal and we'll work with everyone to make sure that we're following the proper procedures.

I appreciate Your Honor's direction in terms of rolling production. I would just say that given that our objection that our reply deadline is coming by Friday midday, that we would ask that that production of documents be completed not later than tomorrow.

THE COURT: Yeah, I think it needs to be completed as soon as possible. I -- I would agree with that, and because the alternative is something nobody wants, which is, Your Honor, we're making an argument here sitting in court that we could make in our papers because we didn't have the documents, and that's bad for everybody. We'd much rather have everybody be able to -- to lay out what they want in their papers and then we at least know what we're fighting

about, so it's in everybody's interest to have that step taken.

So obviously I'm -- I'm not on the ground here so I don't really know what the production involves, so I have the luxury of saying do it as quickly as possible and hope that that will resolve all issues. Being in your shoes in the past, I -- I know it's not that simple but I appreciate all efforts that you can take to remove this as an issue.

MR. WESNESKI: Thank you, Your Honor. This is

Josh Wesneski from DCG. I have every confidence that we'll

be able to produce them tomorrow, and if for some reason

there is issues, Mr. Kessler and I will work them out as I

think we've been able to in the past, but I have every

confidence we'll be able to meet that deadline.

THE COURT: All right. I appreciate it. And obviously, given the complexity of the litigation, the fact that I've had a very small amount of conversations of this type is attributed to the fact that you're working together and communicating well, and I appreciate that. We all know how poorly cases work when that's not happening. So thank you all very much. And with that, I bid you all --

MS. GRIFFITH: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. GRIFFITH: Your Honor, Greer Griffith from the Crypto Creditor Ad Hoc Group. While we're all together, I

have a brief clarification question about the hearing next week. I believe at an earlier conference with you, you mentioned that each of the parties would have 15 minutes for an opening statement. I'm just following up to confirm that that is correct and that is still your intention.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's my intention, just to basically the layout, the skeleton on which the various facts will come in and how they fit. But 15 minutes is really 15 minutes in the sense of what I need is the basics. We'll obviously get into things in granularity, certainly your papers do that. But yeah, 15 minutes would -- would work.

I -- I -- depending on the -- the extensiveness of the objections, I -- I may have to think about whether if the Debtors are responding to a number of different objections, whether that's sufficient time, but then again, if the Debtors and the various other parties in support are splitting up arguments and we have roughly the same number of people on, for and against, then it may work itself out. But -- but yes, so the idea is -- is brief opening statements.

MS. GRIFFITH: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Certainly. And that's -- obviously it's much easier to figure out the logistics and to deal with all that stuff when we're in person as opposed to Zoom,

Page 20 1 not that Zoom isn't efficient and effective for lots of 2 things, but for -- for the more complicated you get, as we 3 all know, the harder it is to make it work effectively, so. 4 All right. Anything else from any other party? 5 All right. 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not from us, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Thank you all for taking the time 8 today. Be well and see you all soon. 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Your 10 Honor. 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor. 12 13 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 11:44 AM) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 21 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Doreen A. Bolognini, certified that the foregoing 4 cord of the proceedings. Done a. Bolognini 5 6 7 Doreen A. Bolognini 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 23 Mineola, NY 11501 24 25 Date: February 24, 2024

[& - believe] Page 1

&	4	aggressive 14:6	asking 10:25
& 3:3,11 4:4,12	41st 3:23	agree 10:23	assembled
1	7	17:19	15:18
1 7:17	767 3:13	agreed 7:10	asserted 7:23
10/19 7:15		agreement	attorney 7:2,4
10/19 7.13	8	9:15	7:13,24 8:1,4
1:14	8th 7:6	ahead 9:6	9:13,19 11:9
10006 3:6	9	allegations	11:12,23 12:4
10000 3:0 10017-3852 4:7	9019 2:2,5 7:1	10:24 13:22	12:9,14 16:3
10017-3852 4:7	14:13	14:4,15 15:7	attorneys 3:4
4:15		alleged 10:19	3:12,21 4:5,13
10036-8299	a	alternative	attributed
3:24	able 17:24	17:20	18:18
3:24 10153-0119	18:11,13,14	americas 4:14	avenue 3:13,23
	accept 8:18	amount 18:17	4:6,14
3:14	access 10:22,22	anybody 13:16	b
11 5:4	accurate 21:4	apologies 6:9	b 1:21 4:10
11501 21:23	actions 10:2,3	appearance	back 7:10
11:22 1:17 11:44 20:14	actual 10:5	6:4,13	16:19
11:44 20:14 1221 4:14	actually 6:15	appearances	bad 17:23
	11:19 16:8	5:7	bankruptcy
14th 7:5,15	ad 3:21 4:5	appreciate	1:1,12,23 5:3
15 19:3,8,9,11	5:19,24 13:2	16:11 17:13	based 12:9
19th 7:12	13:10,14 14:18	18:7,15,19	basically 10:23
2	18:25	appropriaten	19:7
20 16:2	add 11:15	7:22	basics 19:9
2023 7:5,12	additional 9:3	approval 16:2	basis 10:20
2024 1:16 7:6	9:3 10:21	approve 9:12	12:10,22 15:17
12:1 21:25	15:15	argue 7:15	bearing 9:20
21 1:16	address 15:21	argument	bears 8:7
23-10063 1:3	adduced 7:20	14:12 17:21	beginning 7:12
24 21:25	advocated	arguments 8:7	behalf 5:8,10
3	11:11	10:21 19:18	5:14,16,18,23
300 21:22	afternoon 8:12	arianna 1:25	6:7 8:23 13:13
32891 21:5	ag 8:6	arisen 5:6	15:23
330 21:21	ag's 10:5 14:15	asked 7:3,6	believe 9:7
330 21.21	15:9	14:5,22	19:2
		rol Colutions	

beyond 9:4	clarification	concluded	13:16 15:24
bid 18:21	19:1	20:13	16:1,4,11 17:7
bit 7:16 13:11	clearly 6:10	conclusions	17:18,21 18:15
bolognini 2:25	cleary 3:3 5:10	12:13	18:23 19:6,23
21:3,7	6:22 17:9	conduct 10:16	20:7
boundaries	collaboratively	10:19 13:21	creditor 4:5
12:17	11:16	14:16	18:25
bowling 1:13	collaterally	conference 2:1	creditors 4:13
brian 4:1 5:20	9:17	5:5 19:2	6:8
brief 19:1,20	colleague 6:2	confess 8:11	crypto 4:5 5:23
bringing 17:4	collect 9:4	confidence	13:14 18:25
brought 8:6	collecting 8:18	18:10,14	currency 3:12
burden 8:19	come 19:8	confidential	custodians 9:4
c	coming 17:15	16:5	15:15
c 3:1 5:1 21:1,1	comment 8:24	confirm 19:4	customer 9:24
called 6:10	committee	connection 2:1	customers 10:1
case 1:3 4:12	4:13 6:7 12:25	2:4 6:25	10:4 14:17
5:5 6:7 10:3,18	communicati	considerations	d
	18:19	14:2	
Cases 13.25	10.17	17.2	d 3·17 5·1
cases 13:25	communicati	contemplated	d 3:17 5:1
16:25 18:20			damage 14:17
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11	communicati	contemplated	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11	contemplated 16:16	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16	contemplated 16:16 contradictory	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11 13:21	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16 complicated	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24 correct 19:5	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3 12:13 14:4,20
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11 13:21 claiming 13:9	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16 complicated 20:2	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24 correct 19:5 counsel 8:12	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3 12:13 14:4,20 14:22 15:23
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11 13:21 claiming 13:9 claims 7:2,23	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16 complicated 20:2 compromise	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24 correct 19:5 counsel 8:12 country 21:21	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3 12:13 14:4,20 14:22 15:23 18:10
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11 13:21 claiming 13:9 claims 7:2,23 8:5 9:14,18,20	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16 complicated 20:2 compromise 12:19	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24 correct 19:5 counsel 8:12 country 21:21 couple 13:19	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3 12:13 14:4,20 14:22 15:23 18:10 dcg's 7:8 8:12
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11 13:21 claiming 13:9 claims 7:2,23 8:5 9:14,18,20 10:16,17,20	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16 complicated 20:2 compromise 12:19 concerned	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24 correct 19:5 counsel 8:12 country 21:21 couple 13:19 court 1:1,12	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3 12:13 14:4,20 14:22 15:23 18:10 dcg's 7:8 8:12 deadline 17:15
16:25 18:20 centrally 9:11 certainly 10:18 10:23 11:4 14:19 19:10,23 certified 21:3 challenge 9:2 chime 13:17 circle 6:19 12:24 claim 10:9,11 13:21 claiming 13:9 claims 7:2,23 8:5 9:14,18,20	communicati 7:3,5,7,8,11 8:3,14,15,16 12:6 complaint 7:13 9:24 12:5 completed 17:17,18 complexity 18:16 complicated 20:2 compromise 12:19 concerned 11:21 12:2	contemplated 16:16 contradictory 13:12 conversation 6:14 conversations 10:12 16:12,18 18:17 copy 16:24 correct 19:5 counsel 8:12 country 21:21 couple 13:19 court 1:1,12 5:2,3,13,18,23	damage 14:17 date 7:12 21:25 day 6:16 9:25 16:16 17:16 dcg 3:12 5:14 5:16 6:24,25 7:3,6,10,18 8:3 8:7,23 9:14,15 9:18 10:17,20 10:21 11:6,11 11:11,24 12:3 12:13 14:4,20 14:22 15:23 18:10 dcg's 7:8 8:12

[deal - general] Page 3

deal 19:24	discussions	entered 13:8	fifth 3:13
debtor 1:9 3:4	7:25 11:22	essentially	fighting 17:25
5:8	12:6	10:10	figure 8:25
debtor's 11:3	dispute 6:23	evaluated 11:6	11:19 19:24
debtors 5:11	district 1:2 5:4	evaluation	file 16:13,17,18
7:7,8,18,25 9:9	document	11:2	filed 16:1,9,13
9:12,13,21	12:23 16:19	evans 4:10 6:2	filing 8:8 16:4
10:17,20,22	documents	everybody	16:20 17:10
11:2,4,17,20	7:14,15 8:11	17:23,24	first 5:7
11:20,23 12:2	8:19 9:1,7,9	everybody's	fit 19:8
12:9,22 13:8	12:3,11,19	6:19 18:1	focused 9:25
13:18 14:18	15:3,14,16,18	exact 14:5	focuses 11:3
17:9 19:15,17	17:16,23	exactly 10:3	folks 9:5
deductions	doing 11:24	13:20 14:10	follow 6:14
12:12	16:25	except 9:16	following
defendants	doreen 2:25	exclusively	17:12 19:4
10:2 13:24	21:3,7	11:3	foregoing 21:3
depending	e	expect 8:7,10	formally 8:6
19:13	e 1:21,21 3:1,1	expressed 9:2	forms 10:20
depositions	5:1,1 21:1	extensiveness	forth 7:10 11:2
7:21	earlier 7:14	19:13	frankly 14:6
desegregated	19:2	extent 8:2	15:2 16:12
11:5	easier 16:12	f	friday 17:15
different 14:2	19:24	f 1:21 21:1	full 16:19
19:15	ecf 16:20	fact 11:8 13:5	fully 6:16
digital 3:12	ecro 1:25	14:14 15:8	function 14:1
dipped 6:15	effective 20:1	18:16,18	furqaan 3:18
direction 17:13	effectively 20:3	facts 19:8	5:17
directly 7:19	efficient 20:1	fair 14:19,24	further 12:20
discovery 2:1,4	efforts 8:25	15:4,12	g
5:6 6:17,25	9:19 18:8	fairly 14:6	g 5:1
7:18,19 13:9	eighth 3:23	fall 12:1	game 14:19
14:12,14,25	either 16:18	far 8:9	15:12
15:4	eleven 3:22	favor 16:23	gander 14:8
discussed 16:7	emery 4:4 6:1	february 1:16	general 7:24
discussion 8:11	ended 10:1	7:6 12:1 21:25	8:4 9:14,19
	chucu 10.1	7.0 12.1 21.23	11:9,12,23
			11.7,14,43

[general - lines] Page 4

12:4,9,14 16:3	h	inaudible 11:3	judge 1:23 5:2
general's 7:2,4	h 1:22	indicated	july 7:5,15
7:13 8:1	half 8:8	12:22	jump 6:16
genesis 1:7 5:5	hamilton 3:3	individual	justifiable 9:21
getting 5:7	5:10	13:24	k
given 15:7 16:5	happening	information	kaul 4:17 6:6,6
17:14 18:16	16:10 18:20	8:17 12:12	13:1
global 1:7	harder 20:3	14:5 16:5	kessler 3:8 5:9
go 12:20	headed 11:18	initial 7:13	5:10 6:17,21
going 8:3 10:8	heads 16:22	inquired 7:21	6:22 9:2 10:11
15:3 16:4,15	hearing 19:1	instance 14:3	17:8,8 18:12
good 5:2,9,13	hoc 3:21 4:5	intention 19:5	kessler's 8:24
5:15,18,20,23	5:19,24 13:2	19:6	kind 14:5
5:25 6:3,6,21	13:10,14 14:19	interest 18:1	know 9:12
14:7,7 16:24	18:25	interested 6:20	10:18 11:11,15
goofed 6:11	hold 14:24	interesting	11:18,20 12:16
goose 14:7	holdco 1:7	13:5	12:18 14:10
gotshal 3:11	hon 1:22	investigated	15:3 16:10,24
5:16 8:23	honor 5:9,15	8:6	17:25 18:4,7
15:23	5:20,25 6:6,21	involves 18:4	18:19 20:3
gottlieb 3:3	8:22 10:14	issue 5:6 6:18	known 6:12
5:10 6:22 17:9	13:1,4,12,15	9:6,16 10:7	MIOWII U.12
granularity	15:1,4,12,13	14:22 17:4	I
19:10	17:5,8,21 18:9	18:8	lane 1:22 5:2
great 17:3	18:22,24 19:22	issues 14:13	late 8:12 12:1
green 1:13	20:6,10,11	15:20 18:6,12	lawsuit 15:9
greer 4:9 5:25	honor's 17:13	j	lay 17:24
18:24	hope 18:5	_	layout 19:7
griffith 4:9	hour 8:8	jeff 5:17	led 14:16
5:25 6:1 13:15		jeffrey 3:17	legal 21:20
18:22,24,24	i	15:22	liberty 3:5
19:22	idea 19:20	joe 6:2	light 7:22
ground 18:3	improper	joined 5:11	15:15
group 3:12,21	14:16	jordan 4:2	line 12:7
4:5 5:19,24	inadvertently	5:21	lined 11:23,24
13:3,10,14	6:5	joseph 4:10	lines 7:20
14:19 18:25		josh 3:16 5:15	
		8:22 18:10	

[link - point] Page 5

link 16:19	mineola 21:23	ny 1:14 3:6,14	p
litigation 15:11	minutes 16:2	3:24 4:7,15	p 3:1,1 5:1
18:16	19:3,8,9,11	21:23	papers 17:22
little 13:11	missed 13:17	0	17:25 19:11
llc 1:7	morning 5:2,9	o 1:21 5:1 21:1	parameter
llp 3:3,11,20	5:11,13,15,18	o'clock 5:4	8:10
4:12	5:20,21,23,25	o'neal 3:9 5:12	part 13:12
logistics 19:24	6:3,4,6 7:11	objection 16:1	partially 16:19
look 11:11	15:21	17:15	particular 8:4
14:12	motion 2:2,5	objections	particularly
looking 14:25	7:1 9:12 16:2	19:14,16	15:2
looks 15:4	n	obviously	parties 10:4
lot 14:1	n 3:1 5:1 21:1	16:23 17:2	14:2,16 15:8,9
lots 20:1	narrow 8:10	18:3,16 19:10	16:6,8 19:3,17
luxury 18:5	necessarily	19:23	partner 5:11
m	12:7	october 7:12	party 9:14
make 6:4,13,18	need 9:6 12:11	office 7:48:1	13:10,23 20:4
8:8 10:8 12:12	12:12 15:17	official 12:25	past 7:20 18:7
13:24 17:11,22	19:9	okay 15:24	18:13
20:3	needs 6:4,13	old 21:21	pending 2:2,4
making 6:11	15:20 16:8,14	once 16:17	7:1
17:21	17:18	opening 19:4	people 16:14
manges 3:11	negotiate 12:18	19:20	16:20 17:1
5:16	negotiating	opinion 11:4	19:19
matter 1:5	12:13	opposed 19:25	people's 15:11
matters 15:4	negotiations	original 16:20	period 7:4,6,7
mcdermott 4:4	11:1 12:3,6	outer 12:17	7:14,18 8:16
6:1	new 1:2,14 3:6	overlap 10:5	9:3 11:25,25
mean 13:20,25	3:14,24 4:7,15	10:16 11:1	12:1,8,15,21
14:3	5:4 7:1,3,12,23	12:7,21	14:6
meet 18:14	8:1,4,6 9:13,19	overlapped	persaud 1:25
mentioned	11:9,11,23	10:4	person 19:25
7:17 19:3	12:4,9,14 16:3	overlapping	perspective 8:2
merits 11:13	notion 13:19	13:21 14:15	plan 16:7
14:13	13:22	overlooked 6:5	plaza 3:5
mid 17:15	number 7:17		point 8:24 10:5
	19:15,18		11:15,21 15:1

[poorly - send] Page 6

poorly 18:20	provide 7:14	refused 7:14	road 21:21
position 8:17	provided 12:11	relative 7:23	rolling 15:17
11:8	pull 11:10	8:16 10:10	17:14
possession	purported 7:22	relevance	room 6:19
15:19	purposes 14:14	12:22	12:24
possible 15:17	put 10:11 11:2	relevancy	rose 3:20 5:21
17:19 18:5	q	12:18	rosen 4:1 5:20
potential 8:5	question 19:1	relevant 9:7,10	5:21 13:4
pre 12:5		10:13 11:1	roughly 19:18
precise 10:6	questioning 7:21,24 10:10	12:14 14:9,18	ruling 2:4
premise 8:18	· ·	14:24	15:13
presence 6:11	questions 7:24 10:15	remain 16:14	run 10:8
pretty 6:23	quick 8:23	remove 18:8	S
preview 16:1,4	quickly 18:5	reply 17:11,15	s 3:1,8 4:1 5:1
principally		represented	saferstein 3:17
11:21	r	11:25 12:10	5:17 15:22,23
procedures	r 1:21 3:1 5:1	request 12:23	15:25 17:5,10
17:12	21:1	requests 2:1,4	saying 10:9
proceedings	range 9:22	6:25 7:3,9	12:13 18:5
20:13 21:4	11:14	resolve 18:6	sazant 4:2 5:22
produce 7:11	rather 17:23	respect 8:4	seal 16:5,9,14
18:11	read 9:24	10:15,19 12:2	16:17 17:11
produced 7:8	really 9:16,20	responding	sean 1:22 3:9
7:11 12:3,19	12:21 13:6	19:15	5:2,12
15:14,16	14:3 15:11	response 7:8	searched 8:13
producing 8:18	17:1 18:4 19:9	8:24	15:14
15:18	reason 18:11	responsive	searching 8:18
production	reasonable	7:16 9:8 13:9	see 13:18,18
17:14,16 18:4	9:22 11:14	result 10:2	14:8 16:8 20:8
productively	reasonableness	rfp's 9:8	seeking 7:1
11:17	15:10	right 5:13,18	seem 14:19
proper 17:12	reasons 13:19	6:3,9,14 8:20	15:2
proportional	received 16:6	9:24 12:24	seems 14:6,17
15:5	record 6:22	13:2,13,16,17	14:24 15:4,5
proskauer 3:20	21:4	13:24 17:7	15:12
5:21	redacted 16:8	18:15 20:4,5	send 16:13,23
	17:2		17:2
		ral Solutions	11.2

[sense - true] Page 7

		1	1
sense 13:24	sitting 17:21	subsequent	10:14,21 11:10
19:9	skeleton 19:7	16:18	11:17 12:9,16
separate 10:7	small 8:9,10	sue 14:16	12:17,21 14:23
separately 11:6	18:17	sued 14:17	16:15 17:18
11:7	solutions 21:20	sufficient	18:13 19:14
sequoia 4:17	something's	19:16	thinks 9:18
6:6	17:2	suite 21:22	thomas 3:8
served 6:25	soon 15:16	support 19:17	thought 13:5
13:8	17:19 20:8	sure 6:18 8:22	13:11
set 7:16 8:10	sort 9:11 10:23	9:23 17:11	time 7:4,17
15:2	11:18 12:16,17	surprised	8:10,16 9:3
settle 7:1 9:19	16:16,21	16:25	11:25,25 12:1
13:25	sought 7:5,18	suspect 17:10	12:8,14,20
settled 9:15	sounds 15:14	system 16:20	13:25 19:16
11:7	southern 1:2	t	20:7
settlement 7:22	5:3	t 21:1,1	timeframe
7:25 8:5 9:13	speaker 20:6,9	take 18:8	14:21,22,23,23
9:14,21,22	20:11	take 10.0	times 3:22
11:1,2,5,9,13	specifically 5:5	18:2	timespan 12:4
11:22 13:6,7	splitting 19:18	talking 12:5,8	timing 7:25
13:11,23 15:10	square 3:22	14:3,11	11:21,22
15:10 16:3	start 5:7 6:18	technically 9:8	today 6:1,14
settling 14:1,1	12:25 15:18	tell 8:14,21	20:8
shl 1:3	statement 19:4	terms 10:4	toe 6:15
shoes 18:6	statements	15:3 17:13	together 18:18
short 10:1 17:9	19:21		18:25
siddiqui 3:18	states 1:1,12	thank 6:11,21 8:22 13:12,13	tom 5:9 6:22
5:17	5:3	16:21 17:3,5	17:8
sides 11:18	steen 3:3 5:10	18:9,20 19:22	tomorrow
signature 21:5	step 16:15,15	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	17:17 18:11
silo 13:22	16:21,21 18:1	20:7,9,11	totally 10:7
siloed 11:8,8	stick 10:1	theoretically	transcribed
siloing 10:6	straightforw	10:13	2:25
simple 18:7	6:23	things 7:2 17:9	transcript 21:4
simply 8:17	street 3:23	19:10 20:2	trouble 10:6,12
13:22	stuff 19:25	think 6:17,23	true 21:4
		7:19 8:7 9:9,11	
		9:25 10:9,11	

[trust - zoom] Page 8

trust 15:13	values 11:14	8:22,23 10:14
try 9:5 11:19	vanderbilt 4:6	13:5 18:9,10
trying 11:16	various 10:4	white 4:12 6:7
12:20	19:7,17	work 11:16
two 10:15	veritext 21:20	16:7 17:11
16:15,21 17:9	view 10:5	18:12,20 19:12
type 18:18	14:15,25 15:1	19:19 20:3
u	views 6:19	working 9:5
u.s. 1:23	15:11	18:18
ultimately 10:5	virtual 6:19	written 6:10
under 9:15	virtually 3:8,9	X
16:5,9,14,17	3:16,17,18 4:1 4:2,9,10,17	x 1:4,10
17:11	volume 8:14	y
underlying	volume 8.14 voluminous	yeah 17:18
10:16	15:2	19:6,11
understand 8:9		yesterday 8:12
14:21 16:21	W	16:7
understanding	wait 15:17	york 1:2,14 3:6
8:13 10:12	want 11:20	3:14,24 4:7,15
understood	16:4 17:24	5:4 7:1,4,13,23
11:20	wanted 12:18	8:1,4,6 9:13,19
undertaken	12:19 15:25	11:9,12,23
8:25	16:9	12:4,9,14 16:3
unidentified	wants 13:17	
20:6,9,11	17:20	Z
united 1:1,12	water 6:15	zoom 19:25
5:3	way 13:18 14:8	20:1
universe 8:25	14:11,25 15:6	
unredacted	we've 12:3,11	
16:18,19,24	16:5 18:13	
unsecured 4:13	wednesday	
6:7	1:16	
V	week 7:20 19:2	
value 7:23	weil 3:11 5:16	
10:10 11:12	8:23 15:23	
10.10 11.12	wesneski 3:16	
	5:15,16 8:20	